

REMARKS

Entry of this Amendment and reconsideration are respectfully requested in view of the amendment made to the claims and for the remarks made herein.

Claims 1-24 are pending and stand rejected.

Claims 1-10, 12-13, 15-16, 18-21 and 23 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander (USP no. 6,177,931) in view of Masahiro (JP 2000-307993 11/20/2000), which are the same references cited in the prior Office Action. The instant Office Action, in reply to applicant's prior response, states "Alexander discloses 'obtaining the key words from a television program and searching the Internet for related documents' is one of the preferred [embodiments] and/or illustrative of the inventive concept; the scope of the invention is not to be restricted to such embodiment. Various and numerous other arrangements may be devised by one skilled in the art without departing from the spirit and scope of this invention (col. 35, lines 38-44). For such of embodiment can be illustrated by Masahiro wherein Masahiro disclose the concept of extracting the keywords 'Golf', 'Ozaki twin' and a 'driver' to search for the TV programs which contains the keyword of one of the above in a program tile [sic] (page 4, lines 10-18). This is well settled rule that a reference must be considered not only for what it expressly teaches, but also for what it fairly suggests. See *In re Burkel* ... which indicates such fair suggestion to unpreferred [sic] embodiments must be considered even if they were not illustrated. Additionally, it is an equally well settled rule that what a reference can be said to fairly suggest relates to the concepts fairly contained therein and is not limited by the specific structure chosen to illustrate such concepts. ... " The Office Action further states "Alexander in unpreferred [sic] embodiments which indicate the invention can be arrangements may be devised by one skilled in the art to arrive at the concept of the main invention. This suggestion of various and numerous arrangement are [sic] suggested by Masahiro where Masahiro discloses the system to search for the TV programs using the extracted key words ... from the documents on the Internet (col. 4, lines 10-18). Therefore, the motivation is to allow the system having flexible tools to conduct the search beyond the Internet in order to retrieve more information which is interested [sic] to the user."

The Office Action, on page 5, section 3, further refers to col. 19, lines 5-7 and 7-11, of Alexander for teaching the claim elements "sending key object to a search capable video recorder" and "conducting a key object search with said search recorder."

Applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the reason for rejecting the claims, as Alexander fails to teach the subject matter recited in the claims. Rather, Alexander teaches that a user searches an index of related reports that are stored on the Internet. When one of the indexed reports is selected an associated video clip is played and, possibly recorded. See col. 19, lines 5-12, ("[t]he viewer can search an index, available on the Internet and created by a news data service, of recorded television news programs and reports. The viewer can search the index. If the viewer selects one of the indexed reports a video clip of the indexed report will be shown in the area on the screen occupied by the Internet web site display, or any alternate area or portion of the on-screen display. The viewer can instruct the EPG to record the video clip.")

Hence, Alexander fails to teach that the searching is performed by a searchable recorder to which the viewer provides key objects. Alexander is totally silent with regard to this feature of the instant invention as Alexander teaches the viewer performing the search.

Masahiro discloses a system for reserving recording or reproducing recorded program from television program table presented in relation with file object references. (see Title).

Contrary to the reason for rejecting the claims, the Office Action has failed to show that the combination of Alexander and Masahiro teaches all the elements recited in the independent claims as Alexander fails to teach providing the key object information to a searchable video recorder and Masahiro fails to provide any teaching to correct this deficiency.

For at least this reason, applicant submits that the reason for the rejection has been overcome and the rejection can no longer be sustained. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 1, for example.

With regard to the remaining independent claims, these claims recite subject matter similar to that recited in claim 1 and were rejected citing the same references used in rejecting claim 1. Thus, applicant's remarks made in response to the rejection of claim

1 are also applicable in response to the rejection of the remaining independent claims. Applicant submits that in view of the amendments made to the claims and for the remarks made with regard to the rejection of claim 1, which are reasserted, as if in full, in response to the rejection of the remaining independent claims, the reason for the rejection of these claims has been overcome and the rejection can no longer be sustained. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claim discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 11, 17 and 22 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander in view of Masahiro and further in view of Cargun (USP no. 5,481,296). Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander in view of Masahiro and further in view of Geer (USP no. 6,788,882). Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander in view of Masahiro and further in view of Nilnwa (USP no. 6,118,492).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the reason for rejecting the claims.

The aforementioned claims depend from the independent claims which have been shown to contain subject matter not disclosed by the combination of Alexander and Masahiro. Contrary to the statements made in the Office Action, the additional cited references fail to provide teaching or suggestion to correct the deficiency noted in the combination of Alexander and Masahiro. Hence, even if there were some motivation to combine the teachings of the cited references, the device formed from the teachings of the cited references fails to teach all the features recited an independent claim, and consequently, the aforementioned dependent claims.

For at least this reason applicant submits that the reason for the rejection has been overcome and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Piotrowski
Registration No. 42,079



Date: January 25, 2007

By: Steve Cha
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,069

Mail all correspondence to:

Dan Piotrowski, Registration No. 42,079
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9624
Fax: (914) 332-0615